



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/853,227	05/11/2001	Douglas Allan Royce	4519RC2R2	6354

27752 7590 10/22/2002

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION  
WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161  
6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE  
CINCINNATI, OH 45224

EXAMINER

WEBMAN, EDWARD J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1617

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2002

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/853227

Applicant(s)

ROYCE

Examiner

WERNER

Group Art Unit

1617

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

## Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/12/02
- ☐ This action is FINAL.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- ☐ Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.
- ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
  - ☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1617

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-27, drawn to a composition, classified in class 525, subclass 54.21.
- II. Claims 28-37, drawn to a method of using, classified in class 514, subclass 881.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the process as claimed can be practiced with a materially different product such as a shampoo composition without a conditioning agent..

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Should applicants elect Group I, the following election of species is required.

Claims 6-7, 18-20 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising cationic polymer<sub>1</sub>. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

CATIONIC  
POLYMER

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

poly dimethyl siloxane  
Claims 11, 13-14, 16, 17 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising conditioning agents insoluble hair. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

One ultimate cationic polymer conditioning agents and one ultimate <sup>n</sup>isolable hair-conditioning agent must be elected.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

A phone restriction was not attempted in view of the complexity of the requirement.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward Webman whose telephone number is (703) 308-4432. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9 Am 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, S. Padmanabhan can be reached on (703) 308-0570. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3592 for regular communications and (703) 305-3592 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Webman/LR  
September 24, 2002

  
EDWARD J. WEBMAN  
PATENT EXAMINER  
GROUP 1500